

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF UROLOGY AND SEXOLOGY

WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M. D., EDITOR.

VOL. XIV.

MAY, 1918.

No. 5.

FOR THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF UROLOGY AND SEXOLOGY.

SEXUAL ABSTINENCE AND HEALTH.*

By WILHELM STEKEL, M.D., Vienna.

Translated and Annotated

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, M.D., New York.

"But if they have not continency, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn."—Paul to the Corinthians.

I.

If ever I wished for a thousand tongues, the eloquence of a publicist, the graphic skill of a poet, or the persuasive powers of the scholar, it is now, in connection with the difficult theme that I am about to discuss: abstinence and health. Lies a thousand years old, prejudices deep-rooted, hypocrisy ineradicable, prudery false as dicers' oaths, science scorned as superstition, superstition cherished as science,—all organized into a chaotic tangle in which it is difficult to find the Ariadne thread that will lead us out of the unnatural labyrinth into nature's fresh and healthy air.

Does such chastity as the children of men dream of and yearn for really exist? Meseems this wonderful little flower blooms on some lofty mountain peak, the path to which no man has ever trod. We have never seen it. We must only believe what the poets tell us,—and poets have not always proved trustworthy although they have often come nearer the goddess Truth than the learned ones.

I see some, indignant, shaking their heads already. 'What! Is there really no such thing as chastity? Does our author intend to deny the costliest treasure of our civilization?'

But is it not more advisable to maintain our mental poise while

* This essay by Dr. Stekel, one of the most brilliant and successful psychoanalysts and psychotheraputists in Austria, was first published as a pamphlet in Vienna, 1909, under the title: "Keuschheit und Gesundheit." It is here translated by the author's permission. The translator's comments are in square brackets. The Editor's comments are also in brackets and signed by his initials W. J. R.

we apply the scientist's scalpel to an investigation of that quality or characteristic which men call chastity, the gods—virtue, and the devil—stupidity? Let us first ask ourselves, 'is there such a thing as an absolutely chaste human being, a being that never felt the alluring breath of a sinful thought?'

No, there is no such human being! If such a one had corporeal existence he would prove to be lacking one of the senses, to be an invalid, a degenerate, an unfortunate cripple. Anyone made of flesh and blood must be the thrall of his inherited instincts. Hunger and love demand their rights equally. The soul lives on love. One can no more live without love and not be harmed thereby than without food. The existence of a few persons who can go hungry for a considerable time does not prove that food is dispensable. We need only cast one look at the abstinent, dried up, soured old maid and then at the joyous, blooming woman of the same age who enjoys the fruits of love to be convinced of the great value of properly indulging the normal sexual function. Of course there are exceptions. There are women who seem to bear abstinence splendidly, and there are married women who are life-weary and sickly. But one thing must be emphasized. The women who are invalided by marriage are the victims of a cultural sexual morality that couples an impotent man with a woman incapable of love [or who for other reasons is doomed to absolute or relative abstinence]. (Cf. Christian Ehrenfels's *Sexualethik*, Wiesbaden, 1907).

But more of this another time! Our task now is only to answer the question whether there is such a thing as an absolutely chaste human being.

If we were to accept unquestioningly the assertions of some women we should have to say yes to this question. But these women, partly from conscious and partly from unconscious motives, are not telling the truth. Human beings so easily forget what they do not want to know! Nietzsche has expressed this very aptly as follows: 'I did so and so' says my memory; 'but I could not have done it,' says my pride and will not budge. Finally—memory yields to pride.

So, too, the memories of the women who tell us that they were as innocent as a snow white lamb when they were first initiated into the mysteries of the marriage-bed have yielded to their pride as moral women and forgotten what they had known of those mysteries long before that eventful occasion. Why, even in the period of chastest innocence they already had knowledge of the sexual processes. In the unconscious mind lay the repressed experiences, the

half-suppressed longings and more or less definite fantasies, waiting to be freed and new-discovered, and in the meantime causing all kinds of nervous symptoms, taking from the joy of life, impairing the individual's usefulness, bringing about a splitting of the personality and a wide gap between the conscious and the unconscious thoughts.

There are no absolutely chaste human beings. They strive to be chaste and some, perhaps, succeed. But what's to prevent them thinking unchaste thoughts? And even though they do not want to think such things they can't help doing so.

Most persons have wholly false notions of the world. The myth about chastity is no more than a myth, no more than the striving to be chaste,—the embodiment of the wish for chastity.

"And how about our children?" I hear an anxious mother exclaim. Are not our children the surest proof that chastity lives in our midst, strives for fulfillment and sovereignty, and is hindered from flourishing only by our sinful lives? Is there anything purer, more innocent, more chaste, than a young child that is still unacquainted with sinful love?

O, that it were! Would that children were, in truth, such unspotted, stainless beings! "This young child, innocent as an angel"—a more untruthful sentence was never uttered.

If we could recall what our own childhood was, what our own first sexual sensations and experiences were, it would be an easy matter to know what children really are. But, alas! most of us have "repressed" [*i. e.* forced out of consciousness] these memories. Memory has surrendered to the conventional moral ideal and we have forgotten our childhood. I have gone into this subject thoroughly in my book on 'anxiety states' (*Nervöse Angstzustände*, Vienna, 2d ed., 1913). But even there only part of my experiences are recorded. It would be a difficult matter to find an adult Don Juan whose erotic fantasies would measure up to the similar products of some children's brains. In his epochal treatise on the sexual function (*Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*), Freud characterizes the child as "polymorph perverse." This frequently quoted characterization hits the nail square on the head. There is no perversion that children could not manifest to an extraordinary degree.

The *exhibitionism* of children is very striking. By nature all children are exhibitionists, deriving great pleasure from exposing themselves. We have to be educated to modesty. But the opposite of this instinct, the desire to see others exposed [*Voyeurism*], is

just as universal in young children [and is never dead even in adults. How many men can resist gazing at the shapely leg of a woman wearing a short skirt?] The child is a typical voyeur [*i. e.* peeper], such as we are familiar with from the histories of our patients [and from police records]. The child is a *fetichist* as well as a *sadist*, especially the latter. That children are by nature disposed to cruelty we know even from those psychologists who look upon any manifestation of sexuality in a child as an evidence of 'degeneration.' These observers have only failed to recognize the erotic element in cruelty.

II.

All human impulses or instincts go hand in hand with their opposites, [*i. e.*, coexist in the soul]. Every sadist is also a masochist. The pleasure one derives from suffering links itself with the pleasure of inflicting pain on another. [Hence, it is better to speak of a sado-masochistic impulse than of sadistic and masochistic impulses. The sadist's masochistic pleasure may be due to his unconscious identification of himself with the victim of his cruelty.] These phenomena are typically illustrated by children. Many a child that tortures its teacher with its caprices and whims is thereby only gratifying its sadistic impulse. And when it carries its mischievousness or wickedness to such a point that it has to be punished for its misbehavior the masochistic element comes into its own. The great, upright and god-inspired Rousseau has given us a faithful description of these matters in his "Confessions." But the number of such little Rousseaus is legion. Unfortunately however, they are all, like most other children, splendid and cunning liars who never tell us a syllable of these things in their infancy. And by the time they are "grown up" and could tell us they have repressed and forgotten all their merry childish pranks.

Especially well-developed in children is that phase of the sexual impulse which Freud calls "anal eroticism." The excretory functions [urination, defecation] have a peculiar interest for young children. [It is attention to these functions that first brings children into serious conflict with their parents and nurses.] The little ones are sharp observers and know the weaknesses of their elders better than these know them themselves. The readiness of the little ones to lose themselves in fantastic day-dreams now stands them in good stead. They magnify and vulgarize what they see and in their fantasies they picture situations and orgies such as the fantasies of a Casanova, a Marquis de Sade or a Retif de la Bretonne could scarcely conceive.

One who wants to get a good picture of the limitless eroticism

of young children should read Freud's recently-published analysis of a five year old boy's phobia (*Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben* in the "Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen," vol. I., part I, Vienna, 1909). There we see what goes on in the soul of a child scarcely out of its swaddling clouts. What complicated erotic problems and conflicts fill the little one's soul and shake its psychic equilibrium! But be it noted that we are speaking of children in the first years of life! of darling little youngsters who have not been subjected to cultural influences and who are not entitled to be considered "civilized." [The young child represents mankind in a primitive state of culture.] After this period of unbridled erotic fantasies the influence of religious and ethical inhibitions begins to make itself felt. Up to this time the child has made its parents, brothers and sisters the subject of erotic fantasies because they are nearest to it and always before it. Thoughts of incest, in fact, almost always dominate the beginning of the sexual life. There is a time in the lives of all in which sensual love and child love coalesce in one emotion and cannot be severed. For, in truth, there is but one kind of love—and that is the erotic. All other forms of love are merely modifications of this fundamental passion. But have we not just said something about the influence of certain inhibitions or restraining ideas? The child begins to perceive something 'sinful' about its erotic impulse. It is gradually instilled with the idea that there is something dirty, impure, wicked, about these impulses. What was formerly a source of pleasure is converted into a source of pain, is repressed and treated as something disgusting. What was formerly a source of erotic curiosity is now converted into shame, into 'not wanting to see.'

Shame and disgust are sexual emotions—but with a negative sign. That is why we must not look upon those excessively bashful boys and girls who are so easily disgusted at a bodily touch as asexual beings. On the contrary! These affects, if strongly developed, prove that their owners are intensely erotic individuals who have forcibly repressed their instincts.

An absolutely chaste human being ought really not to know any feeling of shame. Shame is an admission of knowledge of sexual matters. One who is ashamed knows what he is ashamed of. The fig leaf is wanted by the Eve who has tasted of the tree of knowledge.

If the infantile pleasure in the erotic processes was great and subsequently, as a result of education, was perceived as painful, it

has been transformed into displeasure. From desire, the impulse to touch certain parts of the body, comes disgust, the fear of touching. If this repression goes beyond a certain limit the individual loses the power to love. The longing for love is destroyed by the fear of love. *I.E.*, two forces struggle for the mastery of the soul and one emotion prevents the other from asserting itself.

Such human beings become 'neurotic'—or, as we have heretofore said, 'nervous.' They live in a state of constant psychic conflict. (See my pamphlet on 'the causes of nervousness.' *Die Ursachen der Nervosität.*) Various impulses have been repressed into the unconscious. Consciousness is dominated by the inhibiting principles [or ideals]. The conscious and unconscious wishes are in sharp contrast to each other and there is unceasing bitter enmity between them. The unconscious savagely clamors for love, for pleasure, for gratification of the instincts; the conscious, on the other hand, longs for purity, fears sin, wants to be oblivious to the subterranean forces. The result of this psychic conflict—is a psychoneurosis.

An analogy will serve to make this process clear. The neurotic individual may be compared to the commandant of a fortress who has filled the subterranean chambers to overflowing with rebellious prisoners. He must deploy a part of his forces to keep watch over the prisoners. He therefore has only a part of his forces at his service for watching the enemy without. He dare not undertake an excursion, though the enemy sit before his gates; at the most he can only defend the citadel.

That is why the neurotic lacks expansive power. He cannot bring it about to make a career for himself and to overcome the resistances of everyday life. He does not seem to be equal to the fierce assault of hostile forces. He must always bear with him the worry about the filled chambers down below. He works only with a part of his powers, the largest part of which he must expend in contending with his inhibitions.

At times the culprits break out of their pens and overwhelm their keepers. The unconscious complexes force their way into consciousness and assume sway there. Then we say that the individual has lost his senses; instead of a neurosis we now have a psychosis, instead of a nervous disease a mental disease.

Which are the impulses principally involved in this repression process? Obviously, the erotic impulses. The other impulses are also, of course, operative in bringing about disease, but only secondarily.

Continence is therefore the cause of nervousness. It is a sad

fact but, alas, it is true. Humanity must purchase every inch of progress at terrible cost. The evolution of humanity towards an ethical elevation that can scarcely be measured, that may perhaps be only dimly apprehended today, the equipping of a noble man with noble impulses, costs the unfortunate neurotics their health. This may, in the first place, be due to the fact that their eagerness to get away from the animal impulses in them and to develop into something 'higher,' human beings go forward or upward too rapidly and make themselves believe that the brute part of them has ceased to exist—or has been fully tamed, has been converted into a tame, kindly, domestic pet and may be teased or played with with impunity. [The neurotic is one who cannot keep pace with the cultural demands of society. The demands of society and of their instincts seem to be in irreconcilable conflict.]

But the brute has retained its ancient ferocity. One day it gnashes its teeth, roars, snorts and tears the weak chains that restrain it and—the crime is done.—Or it keeps tugging at its chains and the neurosis makes its appearance.

The idea that we have passed beyond the brute stage is laughable. It may be another million years before this wished-for consummation is attained. To-day we must recognize the fact that all human beings, without exception, are subject to their animal impulses and that the sexual impulse, though it be abused and repressed more than any other, is never wholly suppressed.

Many reformers and prophets refuse to acknowledge this. It is a peculiar phenomenon in this world that whenever humanity reaches a point where it can have its dream of happiness fulfilled, when it has recovered from wars and plagues, when it could rejoice, bloom and prosper, it is overcome by a katzenjammer from too much pleasure. It almost seems as if it were man's destiny not to know unalloyed happiness.

O, these confounded prophets, threateners and would-be friends of the people! How much unhappiness have they not brought on man when they wanted to make humanity happy! They are the prophets of asceticism; they are the first to hear the voice of remorse. Great Pan slinks away into the forest like a tourist, Bacchus becomes an agent for non-alcoholic drinks, and Cupid—the blind bowman of former days—shoots his arrow with open eyes at the command of the Commissioners of Public Morals.

The great slogan of our time is abstinence,—abstinence in every form.

Alcohol taken in excess is a poison. Away, then, with alcohol!

Meat eaten to excess is injurious. Away, then, with meat!

Immoderate smoking is injurious. Away, then, with tobacco!

Love may bring on syphilis and gonorrhea. Away with love!

III.

For centuries pious hermits resorted to the forests and castigated themselves; fanatical, excited mobs ran through the city streets whipping one another for their sins (and for the gratification of their secret masochistic instincts!). Today we castigate ourselves with the "uric acid" bug-a-boo or some other fashionable malady [autotoxemia, high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis] and again we get together in hordes to castigate ourselves. Only that now we call it "great assembly of the people" and speak about "the ideals of humanity." But at bottom it is only a phase of the powerful masochistic trait that stalks through the world dragging the masses, as well as the learned ones, with it. The forces that bring about the numerous hygienic anti-movements are the pleasure of renunciation, joy in suffering, and delight in sacrificing a pleasure.

But the voice of instinct is stronger than all these movements. Do these world reformers believe that they can suppress these instincts with impunity? that not every one has a right to love,—a right that no power can take away?

But let us take advantage of this opportunity to attempt to define the nature of instinct and its significance for the individual and for society.

What do we mean by an instinct? Edward v. Hartmann, the philosopher of the unconscious, says: "Instinct is purposive conduct without consciousness of the purpose." This definition is neither exhaustive nor correct. The corneal reflex, for example, the closure of the eyelids at the approach of a pointed object, or the contraction of the pupil when a bright light strikes the eye, is only a reflex act notwithstanding the fact that it is a purposive act and is not accompanied by a consciousness of purpose. And on the other hand we often see a moth plunge into a flame to sudden death. And from the same cause thousands of birds dash themselves against the Bartholdi Statue in New York Harbor. These animals have been driven to their deaths by the same instinctive impulse which draws the maggot, the caterpillars and all [?] living things to the light, the life-giving sun. But is it possible, from the moths' point of view, to consider this sacrifice of life a purposive act? For it is a fact that there are true and false, healthy and diseased, instincts. I therefore propose the following definition: *Instinct is the experience of the unconscious.* All that our ancestors have experienced, all their pleasures and sufferings, their

joys and renunciations, lie hidden in our souls, deep under the threshold of consciousness. The law of the conservation of energy applies not only to mechanics, but to all psychic experiences. There is no impression that can be utterly lost. [It can be recalled or reconstructed]. Nothing that we enjoy that is beautiful, or unpleasantness that we experience, but we feel it forever. [The impression lives on and exerts its influence when we least suspect it.] The finest oscillations in our souls send out waves into the universal infinitude.

We bequeathe our heirs everything in the best order, our haps and our mishaps, our joys and our sorrows. This is a point of view which enables us to understand the remarkable phenomena of what is called *idiosyncrasies*. Our instinctive *aversions* are the warning voice of our unconscious experiences. An example that came under my notice will testify to the significance of instinct. There is a remarkable malady known as paroxysmal hemoglobinuria whose essence is the presence of numerous disintegrated blood corpuscles in the urine. This phenomenon appears very often after a cold bath. I knew a man who always had a great aversion for a cold bath. All coaxing was in vain. His instinctive repugnance was greater than the power of persuasion. Notwithstanding this, however, he was a man of scrupulous cleanliness and enjoyed hot baths. But once this cold water enemy permitted himself to be talked into taking a cold bath and plunged desperately into a cold tub. The consequence was an acute attack of the above named dangerous sickness. We are driven to assume that this man's instinctive repugnance to cold baths came about as follows: A number of his ancestors must have noticed that cold baths had an injurious influence on their health. These experiences they transmitted to their descendants and this inherited experience manifested itself in the unconscious repugnance to such baths. From this example we see that instinct really signifies the experience of the unconscious.

From this point of view we must recognize in instinct a true counsellor. The unconscious represents, besides the repressed psychic material, the numerous experiences of the past ages, and contends or joins forces with the conscious which, in its turn, is made up of the individual's sum total of experiences and which becomes the unconscious in his progeny.

Taken in the large, all education is a conflict with instincts. The nursling instinctively craves for food; it wants to nurse almost continuously. Education begins at this point. Baby gets the breast

only at definite intervals. But the child knows only its instincts. It wants to steal [i. e. take] or eat whatever it sees; wants to tumble about and play at any time, knows no sense of shame, and sees in the excrementory functions nothing unhandsome. Education makes it its task to restrain all these instincts and to cover them over with a coating of culture. The higher the culture, the higher the ethical and esthetic attainments of a people, the thicker is this coating. But woe if for any reason there should occur a break anywhere in it! Thus, *e. g.*, when war permits the soldier to indulge in murder, one of the strongest primordial instincts in man, we are sure to see also an outbreak of the vast army of the other beastly instincts. Robbery and arson, rape and all sorts of cruelty, become the order of the day. [This is true of all wars and of all nations.] The thin cultural veneer is discarded like an uncomfortable and burdensome cloak on a hot summer's day. [War is therefore welcomed from time to time as an outlet for the pent-up villainess in human nature.]

We must recognize in instinct an extremely important factor in human life. We shall then learn to understand that our *sympathies* and *antipathies* are only the expression of the secret forces slumbering within us. We shall understand why, *e. g.*, a physician can cure a patient with whom he is in sympathy more quickly than one for whom he has no sympathy. We shall also understand why an apprehensive patient shuns a certain physician no matter how well reputed he may be for skill and learning. Intellect has a faithful ally in instinct. A large part of our conduct is only apparently dictated by the intellect. [We may find or assign reasons for our actions although our true motive may be wholly unknown to us. Probably more often than we would care to admit our reasons are only *ex post facto* justifications of actions whose true meaning is not really known to us.] We believe that we are acting independently [or from free will] and are only the obedient servants of our ancestors. We are all shackled by our past and our so-called freedom is only a relative term.

This may be a sad truth but none the less much food for consolation may be found in it. We must wean ourselves from the habit of assigning an inferior role to our instincts. [It was by that ladder that we rose to our present cultural heights—such as they are—and we must not scornfully turn our backs on it.] Wundt says: "reflection appertains chiefly to those factors which belong to the immediate individual experiences, whereas instinct

combines into a single unity an immense series of once effective single impulses."

But nowadays the sexual instinct is held in general contempt—as the Cinderella among the instincts. The natural conception of the sexual impulse is wholly lost. The instinct that impels one to the fulfillment of one's wishes is suppressed. In the Russian steppes a prophet arises and preaches sexual abstinence and chastity; love is a sin against the Holy Ghost. Sin! sin! sin! This fearful word rings a thousandfold into the ears of dazed mankind.

IV.

The movement to promote the happiness of mankind by the eradication of the venereal diseases has become the source of an incredible degree of self-deception. It is of course a sad and undeniable fact that the infectious sexual diseases *may*, and often do, have very serious consequences. But, be it carefully noted, they *may*—and *may not*. Evil results are not inevitable. What is the logical deduction from this? We ought to devote all our power to eradicate the sexual diseases. There is no denying that this is a very difficult task. But some modern physicians look upon it as a very simple matter. All we have to do is to eliminate the sexual impulse—and syphilis will be a thing of the past. This would unquestionably be a very efficacious remedy. So all gastric catarrhs would vanish if people stopped eating, for then no one could spoil his stomach.

And so everybody preaches premarital abstinence. 'Be chaste and you will be healthy!' say these advocates of abstinence. But no greater nor more mischievous falsehood has ever been uttered. Abstinence would be very well if our youths could marry at the age of twenty. If that were possible, I would be the first to preach such abstinence. But, alas! from decade to decade it becomes increasingly more and more difficult for a man to marry and found a home. So that if the teachings of the self-constituted guardians of public morals prevailed our young men would have to remain chaste till they were close on to thirty. [Another and more logical way out of the dilemma is for young folks to get married as soon as they are sufficiently in love to do so and not go into housekeeping before they can afford it.] It would not be uninteresting to investigate how many of our vociferous chastity advocates have successfully passed this ordeal and lived up to their own preachings. There is nothing easier, or more natural, than to preach the virtues of water to others after one has thoroughly

satiated himself with wine. That is how I regard the preachings of Tolstoi who, as is well known, lived the gay life of a lieutenant and then begot a goodly number of children. [Reformed drunkards and criminals who devote themselves, more or less lucratively, to preaching against their former vices are familiar figures to all of us. The real object of the reformer, if he only knew it, is to save himself from relapsing into his former ways.]

As to abstinence beyond the age of twenty, Freud expresses himself as follows in his essay on 'cultural sexual morality and modern nervousness' (*Die kulturelle Sexualmoral und die moderne Nervosität*): "But abstinence much beyond the twentieth year is not less serious and leads to evil consequences even where it does not cause nervousness. It is contended, it is true, that the conflict with this powerful impulse necessarily brings out all the ethical and esthetic forces in the psychic life and 'steels' the character; and this is undoubtedly true of some specially favored individuals. It is also to be admitted that the striking differentiations of individual characters that mark our times would not have been possible without our sexual control. But in by far the largest number of cases the struggle against one's sensuality consumes the individual's available energy at the very time when the young man needs all his powers to establish his place and station in the world. The relationship between possible sublimation and necessary sexual activity varies not only for different individuals but even for the various occupations. An abstinent artist is scarcely possible, whereas an abstinent young scholar is certainly not a rarity. By living a life of abstinence, the latter may gain free energy for his studies, whereas the former is probably stimulated to artistic achievement by his sexual experiences. In general my impression is that sexual abstinence does not promote the development of energetic, independent men of action, original thinkers, or bold innovators and reformers: far more frequently it develops well-behaved weaklings who are subsequently lost in the great multitude which is accustomed reluctantly to follow the leadership of strong individuals.

That the sexual impulse as a whole is intractable and uncontrollable is evident also from the results of efforts at abstinence. Cultural education desires only its temporary suppression prior to marriage and intends to free it then for the benefit of society. But the extreme counsels against the impulse succeed more easily than the counsel of moderation; the suppression has often gone too far and has brought about the unhappy result that the liberated sexual impulse is found to have been permanently impaired. That

is why total abstinence for a youth during adolescence is not often the best preparation for marriage. Women know this intuitively and prefer such men as wooers who have already proved their potency with other women. Quite comprehensible too are the injurious results brought about in women by the strict requirement from them of abstinence till marriage. Education takes the matter of the suppression of a girl's sensuality to the time of her marriage very seriously, for it avails itself of very stern measures. It not only forbids sexual intercourse, sets a high premium upon the preservation of sexual purity, but seeks to remove the maturing girl from temptation by keeping her in ignorance concerning the role destined for her and it tolerates no amatory relationship that does not promise to lead to marriage. The result is that when the girl's parents suddenly permit her to fall in love she cannot accomplish this psychic task and consequently enters into wedlock without being sure of her own feelings."

These are the words of Professor Freud who of all modern neurologists has had the largest experience in *sexualibus*. Such are the blessings of abstinence.

V.

I grieve for the unfortunate young men of today. Hardly have they reached adolescence but they are instructed about the fearful dangers of the venereal diseases. The proper course ought really to be a thorough instruction in the recognition and prevention of these diseases. As things now are, they are robbed of the naive joy of loving, forced to a life of abstinence and as a reward for complying with these teachings they are promised health and, subsequently, a marriage full of sunshine in which all the dammed up eroticism is to flow over from super-abundance.

If these apostles of abstinence would only open their eyes and look on a dozen or so of these poor unfortunates after a decade of successful combat with the most powerful of all the instincts! That they have escaped the venereal peril is undoubtedly true. But in the meantime the conflict between instinct and inhibition has driven them into a neurosis. In their flight from the venereal diseases they have become members of a diseased species which can beget only a progeny destined or predisposed to the same disease.

Oh, the pitiful figures, the unhappy sacrifices of the advocates of abstinence, who pour out their woes in my office! Here are those who cannot sleep, who toss restlessly and perspiring on their pillows and awake with palpitation from frightful dreams; those weak-willed and confused creatures who feel themselves incapable of doing anything; those who have lost the desire for woman and

live in constant terror of the bloodhounds of the law; and finally, the unhappiest of the unhappy, those who have lost altogether the ability to love. Nor must we forget the autoerotists who can, nay, must dispense with men and women because they are unto themselves sufficient. And finally the few fortunate ones who have succeeded in sublimating the sexual impulse and transmuting it into an interest for art, athletics, politics, collecting, etc. And, last of all, the unpractical, unworldly dreamers for whom asceticism becomes joy and to whom 'renunciation' spells 'gratification.'

Because of fear of venereal disease they have almost all developed into spiritual cripples. Let no one think that I am exaggerating. No doubt I shall be told of instances of men who have borne abstinence for years without any ill effects. Exceptions, however, prove nothing. For, as we have said, there are persons who have so sublimated their sexual impulses that they are but little, if at all, tormented by them. They are artists in abstaining from love. [We may remind the reader of hunger artists who have abstained from food for thirty or forty days.] The large number of 'perverts' among abstinents is very striking. Not infrequently abstinence is only a cloak for the concealment of a perversion. Some shun women because they expect nothing from them, or because they crave for a form of love which they cannot find so easily.

Health as a result of abstinence is, alas! the exception. The rule is—neurosis.

[We are sure that nobody will accuse us of medievalism, of prudishness, or of underestimating the importance of a normal sexual life for the all-round wellbeing and efficiency of the individual. But, *ne quid nimis*, not too much zeal, no exaggeration in the best of causes, has always been our guiding principle; and we fear the author is somewhat overpleading his case.

During the past year, the year we have been at war, we have had an excellent opportunity of testing the influence of abstinence on the health of a number of people, people between the ages of twenty and thirty-five. The subjects were in camps, where sexual relations were entirely out of the question or connected with so many obstacles that they did not consider it worth while to take the risks. The abstinence in the cases I speak of lasted between three and nine months. And in no one case was there any ascertainable injury to the general health. On the contrary in each and every case the general health was improved. Of course we are not falling into the foolish error of *post hoc propter hoc*, we do not say that

the improvement in the health was due to the abstinence; the improvement was undoubtedly due to the change in life of the individuals, to the exercise, long walks, outdoor life and so forth. But the fact must be registered that the abstinence did not produce any ascertainable physical injury. The people felt uncomfortable, some of them felt now and then despondent, they felt that they would feel much better if they could have normal sexual gratification; but that was all.

That a soldier's camp life is not a normal life, that it is not a permanent condition in which we would want all our young men to find themselves, we are fully aware. We are fully aware that an abstinence which is comparatively easy in a camp free from any temptations, temptations of female company, of social intercourse, of the theatre, of the saloon, etc., becomes practically impossible in ordinary life. But that does not change the basic point, that healthy people living a strenuous outdoor life, can go for many months without any sexual indulgence, without injury to the system. [If it is true that they do not indulge in *any* sexual activities.—T.]

So far we have spoken of the effect of the abstinence on the system in general. As to its effect on the sexual system, only in two cases was there noticed a partial weakness. But we feel fairly sure that that weakness is only temporary, as it is very common in people who have been abstaining for several months, and generally disappears on resumption of normal sexual intercourse. W. J. R.]

But if exceptions are appealed to by the advocates of abstinence why are not our youths told of the many men who have [never contracted any venereal disease and of those who] got over an attack of syphilis without any injurious consequences and who have begotten healthy children? Why do we conceal from them the fact that a large proportion of the human race is syphilitic and that many have had the disease without anybody's knowing it? Blaschko estimates the number of syphilitics in Berlin at ten per-cent, *i. e.* that every tenth man has or has had syphilis. [This statement is unquestionably a great exaggeration of the truth. The statement is very often made in our own press that from ten to twenty-five per-cent of the population of New York is syphilitic. The truth is probably two or three per-cent.]

It is wrong to disseminate the false notion that syphilis invariably results in paralysis or spinal disease. If there were any truth in this statement we should have to build a hundred times as many hospitals and insane asylums as we have. In Bosnia and Arabia syphilis is endemic, but for all that the diseases just mentioned

occur but rarely. It would seem that syphilitic affections of the nervous system do not develop without the cooperation of excessive mental application and the strenuous life of large cities.

Even the consequences of gonorrhoea are exaggerated. How many men have had this disease and have fully recovered from it, as is proved by their having healthy wives and healthy children! It is self-understood of course that in a disease that is as common as this is very serious cases do occur now and then. But we are not justified in generalizing from exceptions. We are not justified in proclaiming that every gonorrhoeal patient must infect his wife. Only recently Erb has succeeded in showing, with the aid of convincing statistics, how exaggerated are the current assumptions about the influence of gonorrhoea on married women. But for all that I would not be understood to deny that some young men have ruined the lives of their wives. Unfortunately, owing to the sad fact that there still exist unscrupulous men who marry before they are fully cured and before a competent specialist has determined their fitness for marriage, such cases do occur.

[That our moralists, that those who believe in making people good through fear, are exaggerating the horrors of gonorrhea and syphilis, is perfectly true. But isn't our author going to the other extreme and rather minimizing the dangers and sequelae of these obstinate diseases?

That there are people who suffered with syphilis and got entirely over it and had healthy children, may be true. But nevertheless we cannot help looking on children of syphilitic parents with some suspicion. The fear is always lurking that the apparently healthy child may in later years show signs of hereditary syphilis. For unfortunately it is only too true that many "cured" syphilitics and their children who have been considered free from the disease have on examination given a positive Wassermann reaction. W. J. R.]

Here lies the solution of the problem. The venereal diseases cannot be eliminated from the world by blindly disseminating broadcast the seeds of fear and attempting to do away with sexual intercourse. No! most emphatically, no! A new sexual morality must be created. One who knowingly infects another must be punished. The people must be made to understand that the infection of another human being is a brutal crime. The superstition still prevails among the common people that one may get rid of an infectious disease by transferring it upon another. And even more horrible is the absurd belief that venereal disease can be completely cured by transmitting it to a virgin.

Oh, how much misery has resulted from these superstitions! How many human beings have been made miserable by these unscrupulous, vile fellows and frivolous women who for a moment's pleasure have not hesitated to infect others with a serious disease. If abstinence for the healthy is a question of temperament, then for the infected it ought to be an inexorable duty. Only absolute abstinence on the part of the sick can save the healthy from infection.

It has been proposed to compel physicians and institutions to report every case of venereal infection that they are called upon to treat, in the hope that in this way the public health authorities would exercise some sort of control over the afflicted ones. Such a measure is sure to prove futile. In the first place, it will serve to keep many victims of venereal disease from consulting physicians and, in the second place, it will add greatly to the revenue of the quacks. Out of fear of being reported, many would not apply for treatment anywhere and would either (mis)treat themselves or not be treated at all and would either become the bearers of chronic ailments, infect others, or go to ruin.

With such coercive measures nothing can be accomplished. The things to do are to raise the ethical standard of the masses, to impress the minds of the people with the wickedness of knowingly infecting another, and to disseminate far and wide the truth about the dangers of infection. And on the other hand, young people must be taught how the venereal diseases may be avoided. Fortunately we are now in possession of therapeutic measures whereby we can greatly, very greatly, lessen the dangers of these infections [and the likelihood of their occurrence.] The propaganda against the venereal peril must begin with the dissemination of this knowledge, not with the advocacy of abstinence. For it is one of the irrefutable facts that no propaganda can overthrow, that *only very few persons are capable of living in a state of prolonged abstinence without coming to grief for it.*

VI.

I have already declared it as my settled conviction that there exists no absolutely abstinent human being. There are only relatively abstinent beings. How many—or rather how few—of these are abstinent from profound desire? Perhaps the young men who are driven to onanism by the fear of infection? Or perhaps the young women who refrain from the pleasures of love only because of the fear of pregnancy? Isn't it remarkable that

the persons who preach abstinence are those who, to some extent, speak *pro domo*, i. e. those who are impotent, have no sexual hunger or are sexually well-provided for, or have already passed beyond eroticism and sexuality?

The fear of infection begets innumerable neurotics; but the fear of consequences does so even more. I consider this fear perfectly justified in unmarried persons and it will be matter for the future to legislate so that persons up to a certain age shall have the right to decide whether they want to have children or not. The laws against abortion before the fourth month of pregnancy ought to be eliminated from our statute books. [Very few physicians and sociologists even of the most radical trend of mind, will agree with this proposition of Dr. Stekel. Unhampered and detailed instruction in the measures for the prevention of conception—yes. But abortion—no. If you make abortion up to the fourth month of pregnancy legal, it will be very difficult to draw the line. If four months is legal, why is four and one-half months illegal, and if four and one-half months, why not five months? And so on, until the physician and the mother become callous, and cease to consider abortion in the seventh month, abortion even when the child is viable, a crime. Let us steer clear from abortion. Abortion for therapeutic purposes, to save the mother's life, that is an entirely different matter. W. J. R.]

But, strange as it may sound, it is especially among the married, and particularly among the well-to-do married, that there prevails an almost mad fear of progeny. Families with only one child are not at all rare; families with two children are the rule, and families with more children than these are becoming a rarity. The responsibility for this state of affairs rests—apart from the cases justified by medical considerations—on the vanity of our women who do not want to spoil their beautiful figures and on the dispositions of the men who do not wish to burden themselves with too many responsibilities. To this we must add the stupid craze for pleasures which seeks for happiness outside of one's home and knows not the joys of one's own hearth, the magic of home life. One who wants to "take in everything" has no use for children. [In most instances the voluntary limitation of offspring is due to wholly proper and praiseworthy economic considerations.]

In families in which Malthusianism is practised the most remarkable results of relative abstinence may be seen. Apprehension neurosis is fostered by [almost all] the various methods adopted to prevent pregnancy. Not infrequently we find husband

and wife occupying separate bedrooms and attempting to live in abstinence. Usually this abstinence is a one-sided affair, *i. e.*, the wife fears pregnancy more than a neurosis or her husband's infidelity. Very often one hears the almost unbelievable remark: 'let him do what he pleases, if only he leaves me alone. [It may be mentioned as a tribute to nature's cunning that man has not yet succeeded in devising an appliance or satisfactory procedure that will surely prevent conception.]

And unquestionably there are naive women who imagine that they have transformed their husbands into asexual beings; women who flatter themselves that their husbands love them even if they do not cohabit with them.

The evil consequences of such a life do not fail to manifest themselves. The women usually become extremely irritable. The most trivial thing excites them. Their discontent, which means (though they do not realize it) only non-gratification, grows from day to day and applies to the husband, the children, the friends, and life itself. [Nothing satisfies them.] Turbulent "scenes" displace the household quiet. Freakish moods drive the husband into the peaceful atmosphere of the café. The servants can't be induced to stay longer than a week. The children are the victims of exaggerated love alternating with undue severity, thus having their psychic equanimity so disturbed that they too become predisposed to all sorts of neuroses. Bodily symptoms also make their appearance, *viz.*: a heaviness about the heart [grief], pains in the region of the heart [heartache], palpitation [manifesting excitement], dyspnoea, night sweats, fainting spells, digestive disturbances, especially vomiting [disgust], all sorts of muscular cramps, creepy sensations in the skin, as well as an endless group of hypochondriacal fears. [There is no such entity as 'nervous dyspepsia,' 'nervous heart' or 'nervous headache,' etc. All these and many other so-called 'nervous' diseases are only local manifestations of apprehension hysteria or apprehension neurosis.] For apprehension dominates the afflicted individual and attaches itself spasmodically to any available object. More of this will be found in my book on 'anxiety states' (*Nervöse Angstzustände*), in which many illustrative cases are recorded.

Remarkably enough thereafter this apprehension frequently manifests itself in connection with the sexual life. It manifests itself as fear of venereal infection, and finally as fear of the sexual act itself. Thus there ensues a 'vicious circle' from which escape is

almost impossible without the authoritative word of the physician.

VII.

The idea that with each sexual act a part of one's own life is lost is deeprooted in the souls of men, and to some extent the idea is philosophically justified. For, as a matter of fact, speaking philosophically, every sexual act is a partial death. Practically speaking, however, there is no justification for the idea. We may, on the contrary, observe again and again that in all spheres of human activity men's achievements bear a direct ratio to their sexuality. [This is, partly, what Freud means by the 'law of psycho-sexual parallelism.'] Persons impotent 'in sexualibus' are impotent in the affairs of life too. Such persons are really best fitted for one particular calling, viz: to criticize the achievements of others.

The artist derives the ability to create from his overpowering sexual urge. A part of this urge, but only a part, he sublimates; the rest cannot be forcibly suppressed.

[We beg to take decided exception to this statement. Both from a study of the biographies of great men and from personal knowledge, we must assert that this statement so often made is incorrect. Among the people who have contributed most to the progress of the world, among the people who have done most for humanity, there is a surprisingly large percentage of men completely or partially impotent in sexualibus. W. J. R.]

Abstinence creates no great works—not even the so-called "clean" ones which, as we know, emanate only from the desire for purity. For after all, litterateurs do not write about what they are, but what they would be; prophets preach what they would like to practice; reformers write about what they would like to reform in themselves.

Most great men have been characterized by an active sexual life. In most of them love awoke early. We know that this was true of Goethe, Heine, Hebbel, Jean Paul, Byron, Dante, Alfieri and many others.

The feeling of augmented life force—corresponding to what would medically be called 'heightened vitality'—depends upon the climaxes in the sexual periods to which all human beings are subject. Human beings, like animals, have their periods of heat. Moebius was able to demonstrate in Goethe's life a seven-yearly period in which heightened amatory craving and creative power coincided.

The sexual life and a sense of vitality are intimately associated. If an individual is deprived of his sexual organs (*i. e.* castrated) he begins to age rapidly. This has been noted in eunuchs, who develop wrinkles very early, get fat and lazy. Women who have been castrated show similar changes. The whole vitality of the organism suffers a decline. No eunuch attains to old age; whereas individuals with strong sexuality and well-functioning sexual glands [testes and ovaries] have lived to be a hundred years old and over.

There never was a bolder lie than that contained in the statement that regular, frequent sexual intercourse undermines the vital energies. Only recently I saw a man, 40 years of age, formerly a stalwart athlete, and now a decrepit, hypochondriac, whining individual, who ten years ago had been ordered by his physician to live abstinent and save his energies and grow old(!).

The effect was just the opposite of what was intended. Only persons who have a strong sexual impulse and who put it to use attain to old age. Lorand, [in his essay 'on the influence of the sexual glands on vitality and longevity'] (*Ueber den Einfluss der sexuellen Drüsen*, etc, Allg. Wiener mediz. Zeitung, 1908, Nos. 45 & 46) cites some amazing instances of the truth of this proposition. Let us refer to some of these: a certain Thomas Parr who died at the age of 162, was found guilty of a violation of the law against public morals at the age of 102. Twenty years later he married a widow who avouched that she saw no manifestations of old age in her husband!

The Dane Drackenborg lived to be 150 years old although he was oftener drunk than sober. At the age of 111 he married a woman of 60 and at the age of 130, after her death, he fell in love with a young peasant woman but was rejected by her.

Peter Albrecht who lived to be 123 years old married at the age of 80 and begot seven children. Gurgon Douglas who attained to the age of 120 years and 7 months entered into holy wedlock at the age of 85 and begot eight children, the youngest being born when Gurgon was 103 years old. An Italian baron, Baravicion des Cappeles, died in Meran at the age of 104. He had had four wives. His last marriage was celebrated at the age of 80 and at his death his wife was pregnant.

It is of course possible to question the legitimacy of these children. But the potency of these old men was the boast of their wives. Numerous autopsies, among them one performed by Lorand on the corpse of a man of 80, confirm the fact that

viable spermatozoa in large numbers abound in the testes of old men, naturally not in the testes of abstinent old men, but in those of men who had preserved the vitality of their sexual glands by regular coitus.

Other observers too, (Hofmann, Taylor, Duplay, Dieu) mention the occurrence of spermatozoids in men of a ripe old age. As Hofmann points out, (*Lehrbuch der gerichtlichen Medizin*) in in his 'text-book of medical jurisprudence,' nature sets no limits to man's fecundity.

In women too it is not the ability to love that ceases with the climacterium, but the ability to procreate. This seems to be a wise provision on the part of nature for the protection of the woman who needs a rest after her labors in the propagation of the race.

Notwithstanding this, the sexual impulse is not quenched. Sometimes, on the contrary, it becomes much stronger after the menopause and is the cause of those climacteric neuroses [especially apprehension neurosis] which give physicians so much trouble. [Cf. a paper on *Apprehension Neurosis* by the Translator in "American Medicine," Dec. 1910.]

I know a number of women over 60 who still suffer from the urge of the sexual impulse. Many physicians will be surprised to learn that many serious mental and nervous disturbances owe their existence to this phenomenon. The absurd view still prevails in many quarters that the sexual impulse awakes at puberty and dies with the climacterium, the period when the menstrual flow ceases. Some text-books directly assert that at this time the sexual functions are quenched. This is one of those scrupulous lies that humanity has been dragging around for many thousand years. In reality every human being is a sexual being from the first day of his life to the last. The life of man is his sexual life. [The term 'sexual' in these sentences is used in the Freudian sense and is almost synonymous with 'love'.]

In men this phenomenon is more frankly manifested than in women. They are sexual creatures to the last day of their lives—if they have not forcibly suppressed their sexual impulse.

The celebrated French physiologist, Brown-Sequard, proved the importance of the sexual glands for the individual's health and mental alertness by injecting himself with testicular extract and experiencing in consequence a kind of second youth.

In his 'studies on the nature of man' (*Etudes sur la nature humaine*) Metchnikoff mentions having found large numbers of

spermatozoa in men 99 to 103 years old. Lorand says: "It is a matter of daily observation that persons with a well developed sexual appetite often attain to old age. As to this there are well-known historical examples. Even the wildest dissipation did not interfere with Louis XV attaining to old age, and even Tiberius lived to be 78 years old. This is also true of the use of alcohol and tobacco. We can only repeat, 'quod licet jovi, non licet bovi' or 'what is good for Peter does not suit Paul.'"

I can only refer to those well-known sensualists, the Marquis de Sade and Retif de la Bretonne, who notwithstanding extremely licentious lives attained to ripe old age and retained their mental vigor to the end. Retif de la Bretonne used to boast that he allowed no day to pass without worshipping at the shrine of Venus. The examples of women artists at love making also confirm these observations. The celebrated Ninon d'Enclos at the age of 80 brought happiness to a young man who had fallen madly in love with her. She let him pine for her a long time. On her eightieth birthday she heard his prayers. She wanted to have the proud feeling that at the age of eighty she made a young man happy. When she was 90 years old a very young man shot himself in despair because she would not hear his suit.

VIII.

Yes,— love is ever young. 'Love ye as long as ye may!' This should be the motto of everyone who wishes to live to old age.

Ughetti, a wise Italian professor of medicine, in his 'remini-scences of an old physician' (*Zwischen Aerzten und Klienten*, Vienna, 1893), thus states the results of his experiences: "One may be a sickly plant and live longer than the circus Hercules who can lift a full barrel with his teeth, and one may be moderate as Pythagoras and yet not live a day longer than one who has been as licentious as Heliogabalus."

There is very little consolation in this for the moderates and the virtuous, but no man can alter the facts.

I leave it to the moralists to shed bitter tears and to the hygienists to explain the problem; I limit myself to stating the facts.

Be as healthy as a fish in the water, refrain from all excesses, drink Postum, wear Yaeger underwear, abstain from smoking, drink only mineral water, keep the sixth and tenth commandments—and you will live a good life—but not one day longer than your neighbor, the Don Juan, who drinks and smokes, or his friend Y who is always sickly, stands in front of the mirror studying his tongue fifteen minutes at a time, takes a purge three times a

month, shuns the dampness of the night air, the morning fog and the draughty winds of the day."

"It is not so very long ago," continues Ughetti, "that I visited a nephew in Sicily and had the opportunity to make the acquaintance of an old priest who was also the district physician. He was 96 years old; I cannot say that he was a great smoker or drinker, but this I do know; he had a great weakness for the eternal feminine. And when we called on him, where do you suppose that we found him? On a fig tree, feasting on its delicious fruit."

To this observation he appends the following comment: "For we all know that, *e. g.*, apart from a few little inconveniences, cocottes enjoy enviable health. In real life things are not as in the old sentimental romances wherein these women are sent to the 'spital where they find a miserable end. It is true of course that some of them do end in the hospitals, but the majority of the inmates of these institutions are honorable matrons and devoted mothers whose morals are free from the slightest taint that would merit punishment with such sufferings."

So wrote this sensible Italian. But he failed to see the most important point in the whole thing: that it was love, regular sexual intercourse, that kept these 'immoral' women fresh and healthy.

In opposition to Ughetti I would emphasize the great importance of leading a regular life as a means of prolonging life. The celebrated Hufeland, in his essay on 'the art of prolonging life' (*Die Kunst das menschliche Leben zu verlängern*, Jena 1790), quite correctly says: 'Omnia mediocria ad vitam prolongandam sunt utilia. The golden mean in all things, the aurea mediocritas of which Horace sang so charmingly and of which Hume said that it is the best thing on earth, is the greatest prerequisite for the prolongation of life. All extremes interfere with longevity."

As a result of his experiences Hufeland also says: "The following observation is also noteworthy: all very old people have been married and some even more than once, and usually in their old age. There is not a single case on record of a bachelor attaining the age of 100 years. This rule applies to women as to men. From this it seems to follow that a certain abundance of procreative energy is conducive to long life. It is a contribution to the sum of vital energies, and the power to beget others seems to stand in a certain definite ratio to the power to regenerate and restore oneself."

The power to procreate others, is, however, preserved only by practise. That is why prolonged abstinence is directly in-

jurious and shortens the individual's life. As a result of their inadequate use [for an unduly long time] the testes become atrophic and the individual soon becomes useless. He just gives himself up.

Hufeland refers to the notorious example of the Frenchman, Longeville, who lived to be 110 years old and had 10 wives! He was 99 when he married the last one. She bore him a son in his 101st year. Would this man have reached this age if from his fiftieth year he had lived according to Tolstoy's teachings? I doubt it very much.

Abstinence against one's will is not abstinence. Compulsory abstinence is more injurious than immoderate indulgence. [? W.J.R.] Even Krafft-Ebing used to say that he considered abstinence as injurious as excessive masturbation.

Great mental vigor in old age is often coupled with great sexual desire. The case cited by Ughetti has already been referred to. A number of others could be mentioned. It has frequently been noticed that fine scholars fall in love in their old age and enter into happy wedlock.

It is not necessary to give their names. They are all known to well-informed persons. Lorand speaks of a gallant colleague who died at the age of 96 in the full possession of his mental faculties and who had been a fiery worshipper of women in his nineties.

In this connection we must not omit to mention Goethe who at the age of 74 fell passionately in love with Ulrike v. Levetzow. Metchnikoff says: "Love was the greatest stimulus to Goethe's genius." And, as we know, he began to love at a very early age. It is a lie to say that one who begins to love early stops early.

The spermatozoa cannot be hoarded. One who discharges them lavishly early in life, acquires the ability to be liberal even late in life. At any rate, he does not lose the ability. Again and again one hears the nursery fable: This one squandered his energies too early. In truth, the abstinent ones play a very sad role in the bridal bed. In this matter too the adage applies: practice makes perfect. The biographies of Casanova, Bretonne, etc., prove this amply.

Goethe fell in love in his early childhood. His first love was a very passionate affair; and his last passion—for Marianne Jonny—consoled him for his ill-success with Ulrike Levetzow. During his last days he cried out in his delirium: "See that beautiful female head with its dark eyes against a black background!"

Turn which way we will we see numerous examples of the life-preserving and life-consuming power of love. For who would deny that love also has its victims? It is, alas, not man's destiny to be satisfied with a golden mean! And anything that's overdone is injurious.

It is in this sense that I want my remarks to be taken. *I do not wish to be regarded as one of those who preach unlimited sexual indulgence.* Culture demands certain restrictions of us. And the harmonious development of the more highly developed members of the community shows itself in a proper balance between renunciation and gratification. But I wanted to protest against the exaggerations of which the apostles of the abstinence movement have been guilty. I wanted to show that even if indulgence in sexual gratification is fraught with great dangers in our modern social regime, it is also of great value to our mental and physical natures.

The poor "girls from fine families" will continue to be the victims of our false sexual morality. A change for the better as regards this evil is not to be thought of as long as present social conditions will be permitted to continue. The cry for love will go on reverberating unheard for decades, perhaps for centuries, and may even have to be suppressed.

IX.

A woful substitute for love in couples is to be found in autoeroticism, onanism. The consequences of this kind of sexual activity have been fearfully exaggerated by certain unscrupulous charlatans and even by well-meaning and honest physicians. Our experience speaks eloquently for the conviction that of the two—onanism and abstinence—the former is the lesser evil. Excessive indulgence in this 'vice' may bring on nervous disturbances. But, notwithstanding the assertions of Forel, Gruber and others, we must keep this one thing in mind: onanism is only a manifest substitute for normal sexual intercourse, never a satisfactory equivalent for it. [And it must not be forgotten that what is 'excessive' for one may hardly be enough for another. It is more often a matter of constitution than of conscience.]

The aphorism "one is not a substitute for all" is nowhere so true as in the sexual sphere.

...*"It is one of the palpable injustices of our social life,"* says Freud, *"that our cultural standard demands the same sexual life from all,—a sexual life which is easy to some by virtue of their*

peculiar constitution and which demands the gravest psychic sacrifices from others,—an injustice which, it is true, is usually nullified by non-observance of the moral precepts.”

Chastity and abstinence are often only a question of temperament. There is no credit due one who continues abstinent or one who runs after every placket. Our actions are the products of our instincts and our inhibitions. If the instincts are very strong all our inhibitions amount to nothing. If the instinct is weak, weak inhibitions will serve.

Some youths suffer woefully in consequence of enforced abstinence. They are incapable of concentrating their thoughts. They are dreamy, inattentive and make but little progress at school. They gaze into vacancy and start up frightened if they are called upon by the teacher. An inner unrest drives them from one thing to another, from one place to another.

For such adolescents abstinence is a fearful obstacle to proper development. The beautiful days of youth are spent unprofitably, and in consequence these boys and girls cannot acquire the education necessary for their future. One may subsequently study with amazement the change that comes over them when they have stilled their longings. They seem to become different personages. Whereas formerly they seemed to have stuck fast they now seem to have recovered the power of attention and to go forward with playful ease. They regain their energy and capability; in short, from impractical dreamers they develop into practical, open-eyed youths.

Some, however, remain bound fast in abstinence. That's the great danger of this policy. They can no longer find the way to woman's love. A similar outcome occurs also in girls. In consequence of the renunciation of sexual delights they lose the ability to love. Disgust, modesty, and bashfulness have done away with desire. If the repressed instincts have been adequately sublimated, *i. e.* utilized in the shape of artistic activities or activities in the service of social ideas, then the abstinence is not followed by an impairment of health. But where this does not occur there ensues a dissociation of consciousness. Sexual yearnings and sexual inhibitions are in conflict with each other and the result is a more or less severe hysteria.

But in young men there is apt to result a fixation of pleasurable autoerotism. The world of realities, poor realities, cannot replace the play of their exuberant fantasy.—And, besides, they

are happy in the interesting role of abstinence martyrs. The condition which they once found so painful and charged with emotions of an extremely unpleasant character has been transformed into a pleasurable one. This change is brought about by virtue of the masochistic tendency present in all human beings. The former pain becomes a source of pleasure and the new pleasure is not able to replace the old pain. How interesting these ascetics think themselves in their sweet melancholy! They convert the act of renunciation into an erotic act. Yes, eroticism is a second King Midas. Everything that comes in contact with it, be it by way of attraction or repulsion, is converted into gold, *i. e.*, into libido (pleasure).

In this process there is revealed to us the deepest root of the abstinence movement. It is always really only a masochistic process.

I once treated a patient who had to subject himself every month to some form of renunciation if he wanted to feel happy. For a time he drank no alcoholic beverages; then he abstained from smoking; later on he practised vegetarianism and at times he lived only on milk,—in short, he had to chastise himself. All this as punishment for imaginary sins and in gratification of his sado-masochistic impulses.

In human life there are no superficial problems. Only the knowledge that everything has several sides, several dimensions, can save the investigator from deceptive onesidedness. And similarly too, the problem of 'abstinence and health' must not be looked at from one or the other side exclusively.

For it is noteworthy that in our time, which is so favorable to all sorts of abstinence, there should be manifest such striking fondness for smutty jokes and frivolity. Even though in the preceding pages I have pleaded for a freer conception of the sexual processes I have not done so with the purpose of speaking in behalf of these excrescences of an unhealthy era. There is such a thing as a chastity of eroticism, just as there is an eroticism of chastity.

Frankly and scientifically to discuss the sexual processes from a naturalistic point of view, as a matter of course, just as we discuss the phenomena of eating and drinking, I call the chastity of eroticism. Such a frank and free conception of the sexual makes every vulgar joke, every double entendre, every frivolous thought, superfluous.

It is the hypocrisy of our times that has begot and fostered

the veiled eroticism of our modern pseudo-art. There is another factor that contributes to this: the inordinate censorship that curbs all free expression. Were a clergyman to be presented on the stage, the machinery of the district attorney's office would surely be set in motion. Why, one of my friends was estopped by the censor from depicting a public official. In the play in which this character occurred the public official had to be replaced by a titled landholder of the sort that in former times had the powers usually granted to a justice of the peace. And all this on the absurd ground that the powers, the mighty powers, ought not be ridiculed on the stage. The people's belief in the infallibility of the authorities must not be shaken.

As a substitute therefor the malodorous sewers of pornographic art are opened. What is denied as regards political freedom is compensated for by freedom in smuttiness.

How ridiculous will the French and would-be French disrobing plays appear in times to come! Would anybody care to write plays about the other functions of the body? That Mr. X is finally betrayed by Mrs. Y, or vice versa, or that Miss Z disrobes on the stage, fills the philistine with a respectable shudder at the thought that representations of the sort of thing he'd trust himself to perform at a moment's notice are actually permitted on the stage.

But this is not to say that we would abolish the right to dramatise eroticism. How would our literature look if eroticism were banished therefrom? But there lies a whole world between such plays as "The Broken Pitcher" and "How Men Are Caught." In the hand of an artist eroticism becomes a source of the highest esthetic delight; from the hand of a scribbler there issue only incitements that can serve only the vegetative functions.

Chastity will not lose her rights when a natural conception of the sexual processes becomes the accepted view. For do we not know that the whole evolution of mankind is dependent upon the sublimation of the instincts? Chastity must not, however, be identified with abstinence. An artistically endowed individual will strive to beautify his love in an esthetic sense. Before all else he will look upon his erotic requirements and relations as a private matter that he has to settle with his sexual partner.

Truly, the artificial stirring up of the sexual instinct is wholly unnecessary. On the contrary! It ought to be our purpose to find ways and means of sublimating a part of the erotic energies very early in life.

We ought to build up anew an adequate hygiene of the sexual

life, or at least make a beginning in that direction. Such a hygiene would have to start from the premise that a child is an out-and-out sexual being. But, alas! only very few parents and educators know this and consequently children in their earliest years are exposed to impressions which, because of their repression, may lead to neuroses and perversions.

Children should never be permitted to sleep in their parents' bedrooms. And one ought to be as careful of one's speech as of one's actions before children. It is of great importance, too, to keep careful watch over persons having children in charge. The more mistrustful one is in this regard the greater the benefit to the child. Our experiences with neurotics have taught us the most incredible things about the abuse and corruption of little children by governesses, teachers, maids, nurses, aunts, and even—. But let us say no more about these painful matters.

Let us always bear this rule in mind: the later a child becomes acquainted with the coarse stimulation of its sexual impulses, the greater are the chances that it will grow up to be a mentally healthy individual.

And we ought also to be tactful on discovering the first signs of autoerotism in a child. Parents are under the belief that a masturbating child is the victim of a 'vice' and try to cure it by frightening it.

An incurable fear is instilled into the child. To keep it from 'touching itself' it is threatened with serious diseases [consumption, idiocy, insanity], and even the religious edicts against sin are utilized for the purpose. It would be much more sensible and salutary to keep the child interested in sport and play so that it might work off its energies in other ways.

As I have more than once pointed out, I do not consider moderate onanism injurious. If the consequences of this 'vice,' as it is usually designated, were as terrible as they are so often said to be, the human race ought long to be extinct, for experience shows that all, or almost all, human beings have masturbated at some time. I look upon onanism as a natural process which may be observed even in animals. Its greatest danger lies in the culprit's self-reproaches, in the ruinous psychic conflict between fear and desire, between remorse and longing. But this does not warrant the inference that onanism is to be regarded as an equivalent or satisfactory substitute for coitus. And yet it must be admitted that the consequences of onanism (if practiced with a free conscience) are more easily borne than those of total abstinence.

X.

One of the important questions we have to answer is the much discussed problem: when shall a child be enlightened on sexual matters? It is my belief that no matter when we attempt this we are already too late. But for all that a sensible explanation at any time must be regarded as a decided step forward in the sexual enlightenment of society. The more naturally and as a matter of course the sexual functions are looked upon, the more the idea that there is something mysterious and forbidden about them is eliminated, the better is it for the children and the less occasion is there for repression [and consequently the less likelihood for the subsequent development of the psychoneuroses.]

Notwithstanding this, I am not in favor of giving this instruction in public schools. Even tho I do not agree with Dr. D. Friedjung (*Die sexuelle Aufklärung der Kinder*), when he says that 'it is better to impart this knowledge a year too soon than an hour too late,' yet I heartily subscribe to his misgivings as to the advisability of public instruction in this matter, for it seems to me that a uniform treatment of the subject is utterly impracticable. Yea, this instruction is one of the most difficult problems of sexual psychology. I have known such instruction to act as a sexual trauma, *i. e.*, as an excitant rather than a sedative. I deem it best to let the truth dawn on children gradually by permitting them to participate in the discussion of births and love [exactly as in the discussion of other domestic topics], without any solemn emphasis and secretive ceremonies. Children should be permitted to learn the obvious gradually, without making *everything* clear to them too soon.

"The most important prerequisite," says Friedjung, "is unreserved confidence between child and educator. It is not a respectfulness heightened to a point of timidity that will make a child receptive to the educator's influence, but affection and suggestive admiration. The child must feel that it may give expression to all its thoughts and doubts, give utterance to all its questions, and divulge its little cares and worries without any hesitation, and the educator must lend it a loving and willing ear, be willing to discuss such questions frankly, honestly, not dictatorially or ironically, and to give such advice as may be necessary. If these self-evident (and rarely encountered) prerequisites to a correct educational method are complied with, the explanation of even so delicate a subject as the propagation of the species will not be attended with any embarrassment. And for this purpose oral instruction is un-

questionably the most advisable method to be pursued because in this way the educator can observe the child carefully, prevent any misunderstanding, answer any questions and impress the earnestness and sincerity of the explanation." Is it always possible to do this? Kraus aptly says: "All conversation about sexual matters is a kind of sexual act. The father who enlightens his son (as is ideally required) is surrounded by an aura of incestuousness." That is why I cannot make my warning sufficiently forcible not to proceed according to any fixed formula. It is not advisable to tell a healthy child everything. A neurotic child may have to be told all. [With neurotic children and adolescent boys and girls it may be necessary to go into the minutest details.]

Loewenfeld, too, [in his brochure on "The main points in sexual enlightenment"] (*Die Hauptpunkte der sexuellen Aufklärung*), comes out for slow and gradual enlightenment. He says: "The idea—which still finds many adherents—that the sexual is something low, bestial, and coupled with so much that is dirty and immoral that it would seriously threaten or destroy the purity of children to give them an insight into this noisome subject matter, is downright silly." He, too, is of the opinion that onanism *per se* is harmless. "If we consider the great prevalence of youthful errors we must in the first place admit that at any rate in a large number of cases there is no notable damage to health at all or only a temporary disturbance following the practice of masturbation." [As to the possible consequences of masturbation, especially if practised to excess, the reader is referred to an essay, by the present translator, on *True Neurasthenia*, in *THE CRITIC AND GUIDE*, July 1912.]

I cannot sufficiently emphasize the importance of enlightening youths on this point. It is also necessary to point out to them the harmlessness of pollutions which must be regarded as being almost always a manifestation of the organism's self-regulating mechanisms. In most cases the pollutions stop as soon as the individual gets proper sexual gratification. [For a full discussion of *Pollutions* the reader is referred to a paper by the present translator in *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF UROLOGY AND SEXOLOGY*, March, 1916].

I know young men who are overcome with a dreadful life-weariness and intense depression after each pollution and who drag their weary bodies about in the unshakeable conviction that their end is near. A simple explanation of the truth as to pollutions often works wonders [if quacks and stupid moralists have not frightened the youth into an almost hopeless hypochon-

dria], whereas prolonged treatment injuriously directs the attention to the sexual. [In cases of hypochondria centering around pollutions nothing but a psychoanalysis will accomplish a cure.]

There prevails altogether too much fear in connection with sexual matters. In most cases enlightenment along general lines will have a quieting effect.

Common sense instruction must take the place of the current method of frightening young men into a life of abstinence by threatening them with syphilis and the other venereal diseases. . . .

I have already spoken of the need of new laws providing for a severe penalty for anyone who knowingly infects another. With this there would necessarily have to go hand in hand a well-planned, definite war on venereal diseases by the establishment of special hospitals. At present numberless persons are given the opportunity to spread the infection; owing to lack of space, they cannot be accommodated in the general hospitals. Provisions would also have to be made for the free treatment of infected persons residing in different districts by establishing ambulatory clinics for the treatment of only these diseases. And, as Wittels has proposed, the various preventatives for venereal diseases ought to be distributed to the poor free of charge, or at least at greatly reduced prices.

Oh, so much could be done in this matter! But, alas! it is the fashion to elaborate Utopéan ideas rather than to do something practical.

ÉPILOGUE.

My thesis is ended. Within the limits of a condensed exposition of so large a subject it was not permitted me to open up related questions in all their imposing significance. But I have striven to make a ghost of a few current lies and to dispel something of the senseless, stupid, and unjustified fear that attaches itself to the sexual life. I wanted also to induce the reader to think for himself on these matters and to raise my weak voice in the behalf of those unhappy ones who are otherwise destined to pine away without love—because science seems to know no other way to keep them healthy.

Of course I know that I have only lightly touched upon the most important points and wholly passed over many others. To my regret, it is not possible frankly to discuss these delicate topics publicly. We have not yet advanced to that stage.

Not by far! False modesty, let us rather say prudishness, is so prevalent that the truth dare not show its face. And in fact,

we have spoken only of the "normal" sexual impulse, keeping the so-called "*perversions*" wholly out of our discussion. In all honesty I wish to say, and say emphatically, that I know no perversions. I know only variations of a single impulse. There exists no perversion, traces of which may not be found even in the so-called normal human beings. In my experience the numerous kinds of perversions are only particular manifestations of a neurosis. According to Freud a perversion is the negative of a neurosis. Frequently the perversion is the neurosis itself. This was proved to me by a number of cases that were cured by a psychoanalysis.

Be it as it may, the so-called "third sex" too has a right to be heard in this question about "abstinence and health". It is to the credit of Magnus Hirschfeld that by his ceaseless investigations he laid bare the almost incredible prevalence of homosexuality.

But the discussion of these questions would lead us too far afield and would change this from a small pamphlet into a large volume. I shall some day write such a book. But for the present I must content myself with these brief hints and propose as my confession of faith in matters erotic a sexual law that shall take into consideration the following three principles: 1. The preservation of the individual's free will; 2. the preservation of youth, and 3. the preservation of health.

What goes on between two free human beings in an amatory way should in no wise concern either the State or the Church.

True chastity consists in a natural conception of the sexual processes. It is based on that health that we all strive for and for whose sake we—make ourselves sick. We can't look into the future. But we human benefactors who have succeeded in progressing from an ability to love a few to a love for all mankind, we dream of a time to come when chastity and health will no longer be antithetic to each other but like loving sisters, who, taking us gently by the hand, will lead us past the abyss of sin, through the valley of life, into the unknown and better future.

Psycho-Sexual Gleanings

HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT.

In discussing the relative importance of heredity and environment, Edwin G. Conklin (*Heredity and Environment*) reminds us of the great emphasis which formerly was placed upon influences of environment in the evolution of the species and the development of the individual. From the earliest times it has been believed that species might be transmuted by environmental changes and that even life itself might arise from lifeless matter through the influence of favorable extrinsic conditions. If environment could exert so great an influence on the origin of species or even of life itself much more could it affect the process of development of the individual. It is still popularly supposed that complexion is dependent upon the intensity of light; stature upon the quantity and quality of food; that sex is determined by food or temperature; mentality by education; and that in general individual peculiarities are due to environmental differences. The writer recalls that many philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries taught that man was the product of environment and education and that all men became unequal through unequal opportunities. The Declaration of Independence merely reflected the spirit of the age when it held this truth to be self-evident "that all men are created free and equal." The equality of man has always been one of the formulation stones of democracy. Upon the belief that men are made by their environment and training rather than by heredity are founded most of our social institutions with their commands and prohibitions, their rewards and punishments, their charities and corrections, their care for the education and environment of the individual and their disregard for the inheritance of the race. On the other hand, modern studies in genetics are emphasizing the immense, the overwhelming importance of heredity, in both the evolution of the species and the development of the individual. Belief in the omnipotence of environment in the evolution of species has steadily waned in recent years; the old view that man is chiefly the product of education is completely reversed by recent studies of heredity. The evidence of the tremendous importance of heredity is so complete that we may rest assured that thinking men will never again return to the position which prevailed until a few years ago regarding the all-importance of environments. And

yet, the author warns us, there is danger of going too far in the opposite direction. [A danger which Dr. Conklin has not altogether escaped.] Neither environment nor heredity is all-important, but both are necessary to development. The germ cells with all their inherent possibilities would forever remain germ cells were it not for environmental stimuli. Although heredity is a relatively constant factor while environment is a more variable one, nevertheless the two are indispensable to development.

HEREDITY AN ETIOLOGICAL FACTOR OF INSANITY.

Dr. E. G. Younger (*Insanity in Every-Day Practice*) maintains that heredity is the principal predisposing cause of every form of insanity. Hereditary tendency need not be of actual insanity, but may be that of other neuroses; an heredity of epilepsy, hysteria, hypochondria, nervousness or alcoholism may, among some others, lead to insanity in a descendant. The converse may also be the case. "The person with a weak nervous system is likely to beget children with weak nervous systems also." (SIR GEORGE SAVAGE.) Dr. Easterbrook, late of the Ayr District Asylum, believes that the neuro-insane constitution is present in nearly 58 per cent of his cases. Sir George Savage states that in his experience at least one-third of all the patients admitted into asylums have insane blood relations. Younger says it is generally considered that a father is more likely to pass his insanity on to his sons and a mother to her daughters. The insanity of the mother is looked upon as more dangerous to her daughters than is that of the father to the sons. According to Dr. Mott, one reason for this may be that the daughters, being at home, come more under the mother's influence. In cases of direct heredity the same form of insanity may be transmitted, or it may take a different direction in the descendant; suicidal tendency is especially prone to propagate itself. It is now thought that the general tendency is for insanity not to proceed beyond three generations and that as a rule there is either a regression to the normal, or the stock dies out, often from tuberculosis.

SELECTIVE ACTION OF DISEASE.

In Edgar Schuster's *Eugenics*, Dr. W. C. Wells is quoted who, in the year 1818, noted that negroes and mullattoes enjoy an immunity from certain tropical diseases, and concluded that they owed it to the fact that individuals unadapted to withstand them would be weeded out by death. And thus, in the same way that

domestic animals are improved by the conscious selection of their breeders, varieties of mankind suited to the localities in which they live would be produced by the selective action of the indigenous diseases. Dr. Archdale Reid (*The Principles of Heredity*, 1905) is quoted as a more recent representative of the same idea. He, like Wells, believes that the mortality from disease is a selective one. It tends to kill those who are by nature unable to resist it. If the power of resistance depends on some inheritable property of the body, it will be transmitted by those who survive the attacks of the disease to their children, and if these are again exposed to the chances of infection the less resistant will again succumb, and thus be less likely to leave children behind them than those who were better equipped for the fight. Schuster, commenting on this, notes that the action of a disease on the human race is curiously paralleled by the effects the drugs given to drive it away have on the microscopic organisms which cause it. As in the one case the race of men gradually becomes able to withstand the poison, produced by the microbes, so in the other the race of microbes often acquires the power to withstand the poison administered by the man.

HEREDITY OF THE PROPENSITY FOR WINE AND LUST.

Prosper Lucas (*Traité Philosophique et Physiologique de l'Hérédité Naturelle*, 1847) says he knew a very handsome man, of an excellent constitution, but possessed of an unbridled passion for wine and women. He had a son who, while but a lad, carried both these vices to excess. He carried off a mistress from his father, who never forgave the offence to the day of his death. He was ruined and reduced to the utmost penury by harlots. His son died young, but incorrigible; and from the same vices as his father and grandfather. The same author reports the case of a cook, of great talent in his calling, who has had all his life and had still at the age of sixty years, a passion for women. To this passion he added unnatural crime. One of his natural sons, living apart from him, did not know his father, but, though not yet quite nineteen, had from childhood given all the signs of extreme lust, and he, like his father, was equally addicted to either sex.

PRIMITIVE EMOTIONS AND INSTINCTS.

In considering the inborn potentiality of the child's mind, Dr. F. W. Mott (*Nature and Nurture In Mental Development*) points

out that it is necessary to recognize that there is a preorganized nervous mechanism in the brain and spinal cord which acts independently of education and social environment. This preorganized nervous mechanism presides over the instincts and emotions essential for the preservation of the individual and the species. The instincts are of the same nature in man as in animals, and the primitive emotions are similar in character, but are of a lower order in the latter and incapable of developing into passions or sentiments; they differ in their mode of expression owing to the more refined nature of the human body and complexity of its movements. The desires, the associated instincts, the primitive emotions and passions are common to all human beings whether primitive savages or cultured races. They are best observed in children, savages, and feeble-minded adults in whom the highest control is either undeveloped or imperfectly developed. Whereas the individual experience of every other animal is almost entirely lost when it dies, man, by virtue of his acquirements of speech and the creative use of the hand in perpetuating his thoughts, feelings and ideals, has slowly built up a great social heritage. The brain of the individual is the receptor of this social mind, which printed language and other creations of man's hand have placed at the disposal of all mankind.

SEX IN RELATION TO CRIME AND INSANITY.

Sex is continually influencing the character and behavior of both men and women in all grades of society. But inasmuch as the sexual desire in the male is more insistent than in the female and persists much longer, Dr. F. W. Mott (*Nature and Nurture in Mental Development*) asserts that, biologically speaking, it is incorrect to speak of equality of the sexes. Moreover, the desire is periodically continuous in the male; whereas in the female it is more or less in abeyance during gestation. The periodicity of sexual desire may be explained by hormones (excitants) produced by the passage into the circulating blood of internal secretions of the reproductive organs, which arouse in the brain a vague desire. Human beings, like animals, have no voluntary control over this bio-chemical stimulus. . . . Experience and experiments show that the subtle bio-chemical hormones produced by the reproductive glands of the respective sexes promote the development of those secondary sexual bodily and mental characters which in adolescence differentiate the male from the female.

The different attitude peculiar to sex manifests itself in different ways. A woman is more timorous, impulsive, sentimental and emotional than a man; she is intellectually different, for she has a quicker perception and association of ideas, and trusts rather to intuition than deliberation in forming a judgment. She consequently has a less stable mentality than man, therefore, functional nervous diseases and disorders of the mind are much commoner in women than men, and our asylums have more female residents than males. According to the author, this also is due to physiological emergencies of the female sex, connected with reproduction and childbirth. Although the female characters of mind appear to predispose to insanity, either there must be some innate disposition of the sex which counterbalances those qualities tending to mental instability and lack of control, or it must be concluded that the major portion of crime is a social product. The author believes that both causes serve to explain the proportional disparity of crime in the female as compared with the male sex. Nevertheless, crimes of violence inspired in men by hatred and vengeance are frequently, directly or indirectly, caused by women. "*Cherchez la femme.*" The woman is animated by jealousy and hatred equal to and even surpassing that of the man, but physical inferiority combined with fear leads her more often to compass her end through the man whom she incites to vengeance. But by virtue of the maternal instinct the woman is more attached to home life and her children and by this she is less exposed to temptations to drink, gambling, fighting and immorality.

SEXUAL DISHARMONIES IN MAN.

In his essay "A Contribution to the Biology of Sex" (*Eugenic Review*), Geoffrey Smith refers to Metchnikoff as arguing that a principal source of the sexual disharmonies in civilized man lies in the fact that the period of maturity and the period when the conditions of civilization permit marriage do not coincide, and with the increase of population and the advance of civilization become more and more sundered. Man's sexual nature is adapted for reproduction at a much earlier period of life than that at which civilized conditions permit its exercise. Mankind is gifted during a considerable period of adolescence with a faculty, the use of which is necessarily restrained and forbidden until some time after the attainment of the adult state.

From this fact, according to Metchnikoff, springs a great

part of the evils attending the sexual condition of the human race. Smith, pointing out the period of adolescence, when the sexual nature of man is developed, as a period when the character is largely in process of formation and the restraining power of the reason is not at its strongest pitch, asks us to consider what proportion of the kind of evil we are dealing with is in its origin engendered in early youth or even childhood. If that proportion is considerable, a heavy responsibility rests upon a nation of protecting its youth from the evil results of this disharmony of human nature. The problem appearing to the writer to be largely an educational one, he asserts that the frank recognition of a natural disharmony in a part of man's nature is a juster attitude of the teacher's mind than a system of mysterious taboo based on the conception that everything connected with sex is inherently evil. "For the illumination of the shadows of the underworld we may prefer the even if not brilliant, daylight of science to those intermittent flashes which aim at a transcendent sublimity, but frequently only achieve an obfuscated sense of the ridiculous."

HOMOSEXUALITY A NATURAL MEANS OF STERILIZATION.

Dr. William A. White (*The Principles of Mental Hygiene*) in calling attention to the much broader meaning given of late to homosexuality than that usually connoted by the popular speech, defines the abnormal condition as that degree of attraction for the same sex which turns the individual aside on the path towards a heterosexual goal and therefore away from those activities which naturally lead to procreation and are race-preservative. This being the case, and moreover, distinct homosexual types being found among the insane, the criminal, the feeble-minded, the epileptic, the vagrant, etc., the author intimates that homosexuality offers a natural barrier to procreation of the socially inadequate classes the immense value of which, to the herd, has not been appreciated.

SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES A SIGN OF RACIAL DECADENCE.

It is perhaps arguable that a demand for certain forms of socialism, for the organization of all industry by the State, and the assumption of public responsibility for the support of all workers, is a sign of decadent population. If the competent have become too few and the incompetent too many, the incompetent

cease to be able to obtain a living, and the resulting misery and distress make it necessary to provide for them.

Heredity shows that they cannot help being less able, but, at the same time, points out to us the danger of giving them the privileges and responsibilities of ability. Society may be morally obliged to support them, but equally sure it is that it has a duty to posterity to see that they do not reproduce unlimited numbers of incompetent offspring to be an increasing burden on the better part of the community, and eventually to destroy the civilization to a mistake of which they owe their existence. [?]
—WM. C. D. AND CATHERINE D. WHETHAM: *The Family and The Nation*.

THE EXCESS OF FEMALES NOT DUE TO A LAW OF NATURE.

Alfred Russell Wallace (*Social Environment and Moral Progress*) asserts that the well-known fact of females being in excess is not due to a law of nature. He points out that in England, and he believes in all parts of the Continent, more males than females are born to an amount of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent. But between the ages of 5 and 35 there were, in 1910, 4,225 deaths of males from accident or violence and only 1,300 of females, showing an excess of male deaths of 2,925 in one year; and for many years the numbers of this class of deaths have not varied much, the excess of preventable deaths of males at those ages being very nearly 3,000 annually. The author thinks that this excess is due to boys and young men being more exposed, both in play and work, to various kinds of accidents than are women, and that this brings about the constant excess of females in what may be termed normal civilized populations. Another factor is emigration, the effects of which fall most upon males. A rational and just system of society will in a few generations bring the sexes first to an equality, and later on to a majority of males.—[Also the mortality of male infants is greater than that of female infants.]

THE HANDICAP OF SEX.

Man and woman are equipotential but not equivalent. The differentiation of sex has handicapped woman more than man; yet for all that she has the greatest influence on man, and at one stage of his primitive career turned the development of the race heavenwards and formed the most sacred thing in the world—Home and

Hearth. Nature has made woman's life one of special sacrifice, and has so tightened the bonds for this purpose that the attempt to break them and lead what some feminine leaders ingenuously believe to be the higher life of man, can only end in that most dreadful of catastrophes—Nature's Revenge.—DR. DAVID B. HART: *Phases of Evolution and Heredity*.

CUSTOMS CHANGE.

....In the old Puritan days there would probably have been a pretty complete unanimity of opinion that a girl who smoked cigarettes or danced, or a boy who chopped wood on Sundays, or a man who had doubts as to the literal truth of the Bible were all sure of eternal punishment in Hell and that they pretty well deserved it. To-day, however,....we would hardly feel warranted in cutting off their germ plasm...although in the old days, if such a course of procedure had been suggested,....it would have found many hearty sponsors....“Agree with me on certain points of morals or be castrated” is the formula, a formula which if expressed in terms of religious dissension at the time of the Inquisition is not at all exaggerated. But social habits, usages, customs—the mores—change. What was right yesterday is wrong to-morrow, and what was wrong yesterday is right to-day. Who is wise enough to decide?”—WILLIAM A. WHITE.

THE “FALLEN WOMAN.”

....Woman's ethics during preemancipation have brought humanity immeasurable values....Motherhood not only developed sympathy and altruism, it also called forth a whole group of virtues which man seldom noted, because to him they seemed just as naturally to belong to the woman as the milk which flowed from the mother breast to the lips of the child....Her other ethical attainments—patience, considerateness, thriftiness, etc.—were taken for granted, were considered her natural characteristics, as were also her devotion and willingness to sacrifice herself....That the mother grew into closer relationship with the child was a natural consequence of her greater physical and psychical contribution to it. This deeper feeling of the mother for the child was, and is, consciously and unconsciously, the innermost reason why chastity finally has become with many women second nature, which consequently costs them no struggle and needs no coercion....From woman's realization of the fact that her sexual morality was of greater importance to the race than that of man, followed her

deliberate or thoughtless acceptance of the double standard. . . . Men continue to judge women, and the latter to judge themselves and each other, according to sexual relations. Such relationship has determined women's honor or dishonor, morality or immorality, in a mode extremely perilous to their general human morals. The "fallen woman," was not she who lied or belied, hated or intrigued; not she who at home daily behaved in a way which made the home a hell for its inmates. No, not even she who stole, murdered and committed arson; such a woman was only "criminal," not "fallen." "Fallen," once and forever, was only the woman who outside of marriage allowed herself the natural expression of one side of her life. "Fallen" is she even if the most soulful love caused her "fall."—ELLEN KEY: *"The Renaissance of Motherhood."*

HARMFUL LEGISLATION.

Wm. G. Kellicott (*The Social Direction of Human Evolution*) shows how several movements, apparently of high social value, have produced unforeseen and undesirable results. He points to the enforcement of certain forms of employer's liabilities laws which have led to discrimination against married persons by large employers and put a premium upon non-marriage. Furthermore, the result of child labor legislation has been in some cases an enormous rise in the death rate of young children among the classes concerned, indicating that the children receive less care, now that they have ceased to be a prospective family asset and have become chiefly a burden for many years. In other cases the result has been so serious a limitation in the birthrate that communities are dying out, and factories are closing for want of sufficient help. The writer says that such conditions are not only of social, but also of economic and eugenic significance, and asks: "May there not be a difference of opinion as to whether children are better or worse off when brought up with some degree of care to be employed under humane conditions of labor, than when left uncared for to die in large proportions of disease and neglect?"

STEATOPYGIA.

Under the name of steatopygia is understood the excessive fatness of the female buttocks, met here and there in Africa, among the Somalis, Kaffirs and Hottentots, and which is constant, in various degrees, in the Bosjesmans. There is no evidence of it either on the skeleton or on the glutei. It is more than a hypertrophy of the adipose tissue, it is almost a supplementary organ,

and nothing in the European has any resemblance in the slightest degree to steatopygia. This strange "organ," the particular use of which is not known, was found in a Bosjesman, virgin of 12 years of age. The fat increases in size like the breasts.

ILLEGITIMACY IN PRUSSIA.

According to a statement made in the Prussian House of Representatives in the debate on vital statistics, 10 per cent of the children born in wartime are born out of wedlock. Dr. Engel states that the unmarried mothers in Prussia now reach a total of nearly 200,000 yearly. "This great number of illegitimate children," he says, "represents a measure of the morality of our people. It shows that the idea of restriction of families has not yet penetrated the masses."

THE NATURE OF MAN.

Man is at bottom a savage, horrible beast....A hundred records, old and new, produce the conviction that in his unrelenting cruelty man is in no way inferior to the tiger and the hyena. A forcible example is supplied by a publication of the year 1841, entitled "*Slavery and the Internal Slave Trade in the United States of North America*." This book constitutes one of the heaviest indictments against the human race. No one can put it down without a feeling of horror, and few without tears. For whatever the reader may have ever heard, or imagined, or dreamt, of the unhappy condition of slavery, or indeed of human cruelty in general, it will seem small to him when he reads of the way in which those devils in human form, those bigoted, church-going Sabbatharian rascals—and in particular the Anglican ministers amongst them—treated their innocent black brothers, who by wrong and violence had got into their diabolical clutches.—SCHOPENHAUER.

SEX ANTAGONISM.

E. Crawley (*The Mystic Rose*) directs attention to that difference of sexual characters which renders mutual sympathy and understanding more or less difficult and which is observed in all periods and stages of culture. Woman is one of the last things to be understood by man; though the complement of man and his partner in health and sickness, poverty and wealth, woman is different from man, and this difference has had the same religious

results as have attended other things which man does not understand. The same is true of woman's attitude to man. In the history of the sexes there have been always at work the two complementary physical forces of attractions and repulsion; . . . in love the two sexes are drawn to each other by an irresistible sympathy, while in other instances there is more or less of segregation, due to and enforced by human ideals of human relations. The remarkable facts which follow show the primitive love theory and practice of this separation of the sexes. The writer applies to these facts the specific term of Sexual Taboo. . . .

In Nukahiva, e. g., if a woman happens to sit upon or even pass near an object which has become taboo by contact with a man, it can never be used again and she is put to death. . . . Observers have noted the haughty contempt shown by Zulus for their wives. Men and women are rarely seen together; if a man and his wife are going to the same place, they do not walk together. . . . In Fiji, a man never remains under the same roof with his wife or wives at night. He may not take his night's repose anywhere except at one of the public club houses, of which there are generally two in each village. *Rendezvous* between husband and wife are arranged in the depths of the forest, unknown to any but the two. . . .

Sexual solidarity is well brought out in the following. Among the extinct Tasmanians, if a wife was struck by her husband, the whole female population would come out and bring the "rattle of their tongues to bear upon the brute." When ill treated the Kaffir wife can claim an asylum with her father, till her husband has made atonement. . . . The offending husband must go in person to ask for his wife. He is instantly surrounded by the women of the place who cover him at once with reproaches and blows. Their nails and fists may be used with impunity, for it is the day of female vengeance, and the belabored delinquent is not allowed to resist. . . . Amongst the Beni Amer, women enjoy considerable independence. To obtain marital privileges, the husband has to make his wife a present of value. He must do the same for every harsh word he uses, and is often kept a whole night out of doors in the rain, until he pays. The women have a strong *esprit de corps*; when a wife is ill-treated the other women come to help her; it goes without saying that the husband is always in the wrong. The women express much contempt for the men, and it is considered disgraceful in a woman to show love for her husband. . . . The attempts of the Indians of California to keep their women in check

show how the latter were struggling up to equality. . . . The Indian of Brazil has a wholesome dread of his wives, and "follows the maxim of laissez-faire with regard to their intrigues." Amongst the Wataveita, fire making is not revealed to women, "because," say the men, "they would then become our masters." The Miris will not allow their women to eat tiger's flesh, lest it should make them too strongminded. . . . Amongst the Tatu Indians of California, the men have a secret society, which gives periodic dramatic performances, with the object of keeping the women in order. The chief actor, disguised as a devil, charges about among the assembled squaws. Many African tribes have secret associations to keep the women in subjection. Women in their turn form similar associations amongst themselves in which they discuss their wrongs and form plans of revenge. . . .

Sexual differentiation necessitates some difference of occupation, and the religious ideals of primitive man have emphasized the biological separation. Amongst the Dacotas, custom and superstition ordain that the wife must carefully keep away from all that belongs to her husband's sphere of action. . . . In British Guiana, cooking is the province of the women; on one occasion when the men were perforce compelled to bake, they were only persuaded to do so with the utmost difficulty, and were ever after pointed at as old women. . . . Among the regulations intended to secure safety and success of the warrior or hunter, the most constant is that which prohibits every kind of intercourse with the female sex. Thus in New Zealand a man who has an important business on hand, either in peace or war, must keep away from women. . . . Amongst the Zulus, women may not go near the army when about to set out. Old women, however, who are past child bearing may do so; for such "have become men. . . ."

WOMAN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT A MENACE TO THE RACE.

The recent demands of certain women for a share in social, political, philanthropic and educational work are hard to resist, since they are often greatly to the immediate benefit of the community. But it cannot be doubted that the quiet home life necessary for the right birth and management of a large family is incompatible with many external activities, and with the gratification of a desire to seek an apparently larger sphere of immediate work and influence in social, industrial and political life. For young married women, such external activities are a direct menace to the future welfare of the race. Even for unmarried women, the indi-

rect danger is great, especially in setting a false ideal of life before the rising generation. Indications are not wanting that a position of industrial independence, or the wider, if more superficial interests of active public life, with the demoralizing accompaniment of publicity and notoriety, exert such a fascination on the minds of some women that they become unwilling to accept the necessary and wholesome restrictions and responsibilities of normal marriage and motherhood. Woe to the nation whose best women refuse their natural and most glorious burden!—So say WILLIAM C. D. and CATHERINE D. WHETHAM in *The Family and the Nation*.

HEREDITARY INFLUENCES IN THE CAUSATION OF MENTAL DEFICIENCY.

In discussing the bearing of heredity upon the causation of mental deficiency, A. F. Tredgold (*Mental Deficiency*), alludes to Weissmann's theory that the environment has practically no effect upon the germinal plasm, but that the latter is handed down unaltered through all the ages, and simply transmits qualities or possibilities of development which have existed ab initio. Upon this assumption disease and unhealthy surroundings, however much they may affect the individual, are powerless to influence posterity, and "degeneracy" is an utter myth. Tredgold declares that this theory is contradicted by the facts of every-day life. He believes that the germ plasm is capable of modification by the environment and that the alteration so produced may very materially affect subsequent generations. He admits the truth of the statement that certain local properties are not transmitted, as, for instance, the docking of dog's tails, the nose slitting of savages, systematic compression of the cranium, and the removal of the prepuce. Mutilations of this kind have been performed systematically upon generation after generation and yet they have no tendency to impress themselves upon posterity. But there is another kind of modification which stands on a different footing, inasmuch as it is not local, but general and universal in its extent, namely, the effect of certain diseases which, in the writer's opinion, bring about a deterioration of the germ plasm and produce a pathological change in that part of the offspring which is at once the most elaborate, the most vulnerable, and of most recent development—namely, the cerebral cortex. In such conditions as extensive pulmonary tuberculosis, chronic alcoholism, acute rheumatism, syphilis, diabetes, pyemia, anemia and possibly also in some cases of cancer and other wast-

ing diseases, the writer points to both clinical and pathological experience which shows that not a local, but a general change has been produced.

THE MASCULINE ELEMENT IN EMANCIPATED WOMEN.

The very first of historical examples, Sappho herself, has been handed down to us as an example of the sexual invert. She was the forerunner of a long line of famous women who were either homosexually or bisexually inclined. Catherine II of Russia, Queen Christina of Sweden, the highly gifted although deaf, dumb and blind Laura Bridgman, George Sand and many others were partly bisexual, partly homosexual. Just as the latter reveal their maleness by their preference either for women or for womanish men, so heterosexual women display maleness in their choice of a male partner who is not preponderatingly male. The most famous of George Sand's many affairs were those with de Musset, the most effeminate poet, and with Chopin, who might be described almost as the only female musician, so effeminate are his compositions. Chopin's portraits show his effeminacy plainly. Vittoria Colonna is less known because of her own poetic compositions than because of the infatuation for her shown by Michel Angelo, whose earlier friendships had been with youths. The authoress Daniel Stern was the mistress of Franz Liszt, whose life and compositions were extremely effeminate, and who had a dubious friendship with Wagner, the interpretation of which was made plain by his later devotion to King Ludwig II of Bavaria. Madame de Stael is supposed to have been intimate with August Wilhelm Schlegel, who was a homosexualist. When there is no evidence as to the sexual relations of famous women, we can obtain important conclusions from the details of their personal appearance. George Eliot had a broad, massive forehead, and her movements lacked all womanly grace. The face of Rachel Ruysch was almost wholly masculine. That original poetess, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff, had a wiry, unwomanly frame and a masculine face. The authoress and mathematician Sonia Kowalevska, like Sappho, had an abnormally scanty growth of hair. It would be difficult to point to a single female trait in the appearance or character of Rosa Bonheur, the very distinguished painter.

It is only the male element in emancipated women that craves for emancipation. Women really interested in intellectual matters are sexually intermediate forms.—WEININGER.